MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

In Re: MDA Ballistic Missile Defense System Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing

PUBLIC HEARING

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2004

6:31 P.M.

Hearing Held At: Sheraton Grand Hotel
1230 J Street
Sacramento, California

Reported by: Desiree C. Tawney, CSR No. 12414

APPEARANCES:

Marty Duke

Colonel Mark Graham

Peter Bonner

Sacramento, California; Tuesday, October 19, 2004

6:31 p.m.

MR. DUKE: First I'd like to welcome --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

MR. DUKE: Can you hear me now?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Move it up a little bit.

MR. DUKE: Again, I would like to welcome each and every one of you to tonight's public hearing for the Missile Defense Agency Ballistic Missile Defense System Environmental Impact Statement.

This public hearing is being held in accordance with the NEPA Environmental Policy Act -- excuse me -- the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA.

My name is Marty Duke. I am the Missile Defense Agency's Program Manager for the development of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

I would like to introduce Colonel Mark Graham, who is with the Missile Defense Agency's Office of General Counsel. Colonel Graham will talk about the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, the NEPA process and the Ballistic Missile Defense capabilities and components.

I also would like to introduce Mr. Peter Bonner, Ms. Deb Shaver in the back, who is with ICF Consulting.

Ms. Shaver is the ICF Consulting Program Manager and the technical lead for PEIS.

Mr. Bonner --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is ICF, please?

MR. DUKE: ICF is -- letters. It does not represent a name. It's ICF Consulting. It is the name of the company they work with.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: ECF?

MR. DUKE: ICF.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: UCF?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're going to give you a hard time.

MR. DUKE: That is fine. That is why we're here, to listen to you provide your comments.

With that, I'd like to turn the meeting over to Mr. Bonner, who will go over tonight's agenda and discuss some administrative points on how to provide the public comments on the Programmatic EIS.

MR. BONNER: Good evening. I'd also like to welcome you to the public hearing. We're from DC so we have to have some acronyms for tonight's meeting. We'll refer to the Missile Defense Agency as MDA during this presentation.

We'll review the Ballistic Missile Defense System or BMDS. We'll discuss the Programmatic Environmental Impact

Statement as a PEIS.

Therefore, at tonight's hearing, we'll discuss the development of MDA's draft BMDS PEIS. There is a test at the end.

Next we'll discuss the proposed action, which is the implementation of an integrated BMDS, the activities involved in implementing the BMDS, which have been analyzed for the potential environmental impact. Finally, we'll provide a forum to collect your public comments on the Draft PEIS.

It's our goal to have an open informative process tonight. To ensure MDA has enough time to receive your oral comments, we'll use the following agenda for tonight's meeting: We'll spend -- the first portion is a 30 to 40 minute presentation with information about BMDS, the NEPA process, the National Environmental Policy Act and our analysis.

The presentation will discuss: What is a Programmatic EIS? What is the BMDS? How were potential impacts analyzed? What were the results of the analysis? And how to submit comments on the Draft PEIS.

We'll then take a 15-minute break where you'll get a chance to sign up at the registration table, if you haven't already, to provide some of your oral comments. After the break each speaker will be called in the order

they've signed up to come and make their statements.

Following the public statements MDA representatives will be available at the poster area to help clarify any information you might need.

Please note the questions and comments provided in the poster area will not be officially recorded. However, all questions can be formally submitted today to MDA through other available methods.

The most important aspect of tonight's meeting is to hear your comments in the public comments portion. All public statements provided tonight will be recorded in a transcript.

Please remember that the Programmatic -- the PEIS is a draft document. This is your opportunity to provide comments on the document before it's finalized and before a decision is made.

We're going to listen firsthand to your suggestions and concerns. As you give your oral comments, please limit your comments to three minutes. I think we've got 25 or 30 folks who want to make public comments.

The purpose of the meeting is to gather the comments. We'll attempt to answer your questions, clarifying the points we've made in the presentation out in the poster area. Substantive questions recorded tonight will be carefully considered in the Final PEIS.

If you wish to provide written comments, forms are available at the registration table. You may leave the written comments with us at the registration table. You also have options to email, fax or voicemail your comments to us.

To allow time to consider and respond to the comments in the Final PEIS, we need to receive your comments -- your comments must be received by November 17.

Colonel Graham will discuss the BMDS PEIS and the NEPA process.

Thank you.

COLONEL GRAHAM: Thank you, Peter. Can you hear me okay? Good.

NEPA establishes our broad national framework for protecting the environment. NEPA requires Federal agencies to consider the environmental impacts of proposed actions and the reasonable alternatives of those actions early in the decision-making process.

The NEPA process is intended to help public officials make decisions based on the understanding of environmental consequences and take action that protects, restores, and enhances the environment.

In the past, the national approach to the missile defense focused on the development of the individual missile defense elements of programs such as the Patriot,

Airborne Laser and ground-based interceptors. These actions were appropriately addressed in separate NEPA analyses that MDA, its predecessor agencies, and executing agents prepared for these systems.

The aim of missile defense has been refocused by the Secretary of Defense to develop an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System that would be a layered system of components working together, capable of defending against all ranges of threat missiles in all flight phases.

Because the integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System is a large program made up of many projects implemented over time on a worldwide basis, MDA has determined a programmatic NEPA analysis would be appropriate.

Therefore, MDA has prepared a Programmatic EIS to analyze the environmental impact of implementing the proposed program.

The Programmatic EIS or PEIS analyzes the broad environmental consequences in a wide-ranging Federal program like the BMDS. A PEIS looks ahead at overall issues in a proposed program and considers related actions together in order to review the program comprehensively.

A PEIS is appropriate for projects that are broad in scope, are implemented in phases and are widely dispersed geographically. A PEIS creates a comprehensive

global analytical framework and supports subsequent analysis of specific activities of specific locations. The Programmatic EIS is thus intended to serve as a tiering document for subsequent specific Ballistic Missile Defense System analyses and includes a roadmap for considering impacts in resource areas and developing future documents.

This roadmap identifies how a specific resource area can be analyzed and includes specifics for considering the significance of environmental impacts on specific resource areas. This means that ranges, installations, and facilities at which specific programs may occur in the future could tier their documents from the PEIS and have some reference point from which to start their site-specific analyses.

The Ballistic Missile Defense System Programmatic EIS analyzes the potential impacts of developing, testing, deploying and planning for decommissioning of the proposed program.

The Programmatic EIS evaluates the proposed Ballistic Missile Defense System's technology components, assets and programs and considers future development and application of new technology.

The proposed action considered in our Programmatic EIS is for MDA to develop, test, deploy and plan for

decommissioning activities for an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System, using existing infrastructures and capabilities, when feasible, as well as emerging and new technologies to meet current and evolving threats.

When feasible, MDA will use existing infrastructure to implement the BMDS and would incorporate new technologies and capabilities as they become available. This would ensure the program could provide defense for both current and future missile threats.

The purpose of the proposed action is to incrementally develop and deploy a Ballistic Missile Defense System, the performance of which could be improved over time, and that layers defenses to intercept ballistic missiles of all ranges in all phases of flight.

The proposed action is needed to protect the United States, its deployed forces, friends and allies from ballistic missile threats.

In this Programmatic EIS, MDA considered two alternative approaches to implementing the Ballistic Missile Defense System in addition to the No Action Alternative. The alternative approach is to address the use of weapons for land, sea, air and space-based platforms.

Alternative 1 is to develop, test, deploy and plan for decommissioning for an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System that includes land, sea and air-based

weapons platforms.

The BMDS envisioned in Alternative 1 would include space-based sensors but would not include space-based defensive weapons.

Alternative 2 is to test, deploy and plan -- develop, test and deploy, and plan for decommissioning an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System that includes land, sea, air and space-based weapons platform.

Alterative 2 would be identical to Alternative 1, with the addition of the space-based defensive weapons. The Counsel of Environmental Quality Regulations implementing NEPA also requires consideration of the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, the MDA would not develop, test, deploy or plan for decommissioning activities for the integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System.

Please note that under the No Action Alternative MDA would continue existing development and testing of individual elements and stand-alone defensive capabilities. Individual systems would continue to be tested but would not be subjected to system integration testing.

Alternative 1 and 2 provide different weapons platforms through implementing an integrated Ballistic

Missile Defense System, while the No Action Alternative continues the traditional approach to developing individual missile defense elements.

I will now address how MDA characterizes the Ballistic Missile Defense System into relevant components and life cycle activities that could be considered to provide a programmatic overview of the environmental impacts of implementing the proposed action.

As mentioned earlier, MDA's goal is to develop an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System that will provide layers of defense. The Ballistic Missile Defense System will be capable of destroying threat ballistic missiles in the boost, midcourse and terminal phases and would defend against short, medium, intermediate and long-range threat ballistic missiles.

Finally, the Ballistic Missile Defense System would integrate sensors and weapons through command, control, battle management, and communications or C2BMC network. With this capability the integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System would establish a defense against threat ballistic missiles.

The Ballistic Missile Defense System is a complex system of systems. To be able to perform a meaningful impact analysis, we've considered the Ballistic Missile Defense System in terms of its components; that is,

weapons, sensors, C2BMC and support assets.

These components are the building blocks that could be assembled with specific functional capabilities and could be operated together or independently to defeat threat missiles. Testing was considered for each component. However, the integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System needs to be tested at the system level and was analyzed separately using realistic system integration flight test scenarios.

Let's take a look at each of the components. First of all, we have weapons. Ballistic Missile Defense System weapons would provide defense against threat ballistic missiles. They include interceptors and directed energy weapons in the form of high-energy lasers. These weapons would be used to negate threat missiles. These interceptors would use hit-to-kill technology, either through direct impact or directed fragmentation.

Ballistic Missile Defense System weapons are designed to intercept threat ballistic missiles in one or more phases of flight that can be activated from land, sea, air or space-based platforms.

Sensors in the Ballistic Missile Defense System will provide relevant tracking data for threat ballistic missiles. Sensors detect and track threat missiles and assess whether or not the threat missiles have been

destroyed. Sensors provide the information needed to locate and track a threat missile to support and coordinate effective decision-making against the threat.

There are four basic categories of sensors considered in the Ballistic Missile Defense System. They are radars, infrared, optical and laser sensors.

Radars send a signal out and detect the same signal after it bounces off an object. Infrared sensors are passive sensors that detect and track heat or infrared radiation from an object. Optical sensors are passive sensors that collect white energy or radiation emitted from an object. Laser sensors use laser energy to illuminate and detect the object's motion. Radars and lasers emit radiation while infrared and optical sensors detect radiation that has been emitted.

The Ballistic Missile Defense System would operate the sensors; that is, would operate from multiple platforms: land, sea, air or space.

The data collected by the Ballistic Missile Defense System sensors would travel through the communication system to command and control centers where battle management decisions on whether to use a defensive weapon could be made.

C2BMC would integrate and coordinate equipment and operators through command and control and integrated fire

control centers. C2BMC would enable military commanders to receive and process information, make decisions and communicate those decisions regarding the engagement of the threat missile.

The C2BMC would include fiber optic cable, computer terminals and antennas and would operate from land, sea, air and space-based platforms.

The last category of components is support assets. The support assets would be used to facilitate developing, testing and deployment of the Ballistic Missile Defense System components. Support assets are one of three types: support equipment, infrastructure or test assets.

Support equipment includes general transportation and portable equipment such as automobiles, ships, aircraft, rail and generators. Infrastructure includes docks, ships, yards, launch facilities and airports. Test assets include test range facilities, targets, countermeasure devices, simulants and observation vehicles.

Now that we've discussed the components, Mr. Marty Duke will talk about how they can be integrated into the Ballistic Missile Defense System.

MR. DUKE: This slide depicts the various components of the proposed BMDS as we've just discussed. The use of the multiple defensive weapons and sensors operating from a variety of platforms integrated to a single C2BMC system

would created a layered defense allowing several opportunities to intercept and destroy threat missiles.

For example, one weapon could engage a threat missile in the boost stage. And another -- the boost phase being a threat area -- and the other could be used to intercept the missile threat in a later phase after an intercept was unsuccessful.

Components are integrated into the BMDS through the life cycle phase of the system acquisition process. These life cycles phases are development, testing, deployment, and decommissioning. These new components would undergo initial development, testing while existing components will be tested to determine their readiness for use. Work on a given technology would stop if testing failed to demonstrate effectiveness or its functional capabilities needs change.

Components and elements would be deployed as testing demonstrates that they are sufficiently capable of defending against threat ballistic missiles. In most cases, the components would be deployed when testing demonstrated that they are capable of operating within the integrated BMDS and the associated health and safety procedures are developed and adequate. This process concludes with decommissioning, which would occur when and where appropriate.

To determine the environmental impact, this PEIS analyzed the proposed BMDS components by considering the various life cycle activities of each component as well as the operating environment in which the activities are taking place. This slide tries to depict the multi-dimensional complexities involved in considering the impact of implementing the integrated BMDS in terms of its components -- which is the weapons, sensors, C2BMC -- the acquisition life cycle phases and their operating environments.

Because of the complex nature of this project an analysis strategy was developed to effectively, yet efficiently, look at the broad range of environmental impacts for the proposed BMDS.

First, the existing conditions of the affected environment were characterized for the location where various BMDS activities are proposed to occur. Next, MDA determined the resource areas that could potentially be affected by implementing the proposed BMDS.

Finally, impacts of the BMDS are analyzed in four steps. In Step 1, we identified and characterized life cycle phase activity; in Step 2, we identified activities with no potential for impact and dismissed them from further analysis; in Step 3, we identified similar activities across life cycles phases and combined them for

the analysis; in Step 4, we conducted the analysis -- the impact analysis for all remaining activities.

The first three steps were used to characterize and reduce the number of unique life cycle activities, thereby reducing the redundancy in preparing the impact analysis.

The affected environment includes all land, air, water, and space environments where proposed BMDS activities are reasonably foreseeable. The affected environment has been considered in terms of broad ocean area, the atmosphere and nine terrestrial biomes.

A biome is a geographic area with similar environments or ecologies. Climate, geography, geology, distribution of vegetation and wildlife determines the distribution of the biomes. The biomes encompass both U.S. and non-U.S. locations where the BMDS could be located or operated.

The resource areas considered in this analysis were those resources which could potentially be affected by implementing the proposed BMDS.

NEPA analyses generally consider resource areas listed on the screen except for orbital debris. Because missile defense development and test activities included launch and intercepting missiles, space-based communications and other satellites and potential for

space-based interceptors, MDA also considered orbital debris and its impact on the Earth. This PEIS discusses all resource areas, provides the methodology for analysis and suggests thresholds of significance to provide the reader with a roadmap for performing future site-specific analyses tiering from the PEIS.

These discussions outline the type of information that would be needed to conduct site-specific analyses to identify the steps necessary to ensure the potential impacts are appropriately considered.

The resource areas highlighted on the slide with the red star require site-specific information for analysis. These resource areas are more effectively addressed in subsequent tiered analysis for specific activities. Once we decided how to consider the affected environment and resource areas of concern, we used the four-step process I mentioned before to conduct the impact analysis. I will discuss each step in more detail.

In Step 1 of the impact analysis, MDA identified and characterized the activity associated with each BMDS component. Each life cycle phase has activities applied to each component. For example, development can include planning, research, system engineering and site preparation and construction. Testing can include manufacturing, site preparation, construction,

transportation, activation and launch activities. Deployment can include manufacture, site prep and construction, transportation, activation, launch operation and maintenance upgrades and training. Finally, decommissioning is demilitarization and disposal.

Once life cycle activities were identified it was determined that some of the activities have no potential for impact. The activities such as planning, budgeting, system engineering and tabletop exercises are generally categorically excluded in various Department of Defense NEPA regulations and are therefore not further analyzed in this PEIS.

Other activities for specific components such as transportation, maintenance and sustainment, and manufacturing are not analyzed in this PEIS because they have been evaluated in previous NEPA analyses and were found to have no significant environmental impact.

The remaining activities were then examined to determine which activities had similar environmental impacts. For example, impacts associated with site preparation and construction in the development phase would be similar to or the same as the impacts from site preparation and construction activities in the deployment phase.

Under Step 3, similar activities occurring in

different life cycle phases were identified and considered together to reduce redundancy.

The final step was to determine the impact associated with each remaining activity under the proposed action. The significance of the impact is a function of the nature of the receiving environment and the receptors in the environment. For example, an interceptor launch creates the same emission no matter where it's launched. Whether those emissions cause impact, the significance of those impacts depend on the environment in which they are released. The PEIS analyzed these emissions by component for each resource area and life cycle activity where a potential for impact was identified.

Impacts were distinguished based upon the different operating environments: land, sea, air and space. The analysis also considered specific impacts for individual biomes where activities could occur. The impacts of system integration testing was considered separately from the impact of the individual component testing.

Integration testing involved using multiple components in the same test. To deal effectively with integration tests, MDA looked at two generic system integration flight test scenarios which involved a different number of launches and interceptors. The impact analysis for Alternative 1 considers the use of land, sea

and air-based platforms for BMDS weapons.

The analysis includes the use of space-based sensors but not space-based weapons. The analysis was specific for each resource area based on the impact from the activities associated with the BMDS components.

The impact analysis for Alternative 2 includes the use of interceptors from land, sea, air, and space-based platforms for BMDS weapons. The impacts associated with the use of interceptors from land, sea and air platforms would be the same as those discussed for Alternative 1. Therefore, the analysis of Alternative 2 focuses on the impact of using interceptors from space-based platforms.

The fundamental difference between Alternative 1 and 2 is that Alternative 2 includes the analysis for space-based platforms for interceptors.

The cumulative impact of implementing the BMDS was also considered. The cumulative impacts are defined as impacts that result from the incremental impacts of the proposed action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions. Because this proposed action is worldwide in scope and potential application, only activities similar in scope have been considered for cumulative impact.

Under Alternative 1 worldwide launch programs for commercial and government programs were determined to be

similar in scope; therefore, the impact of BMDS launches would be considered cumulatively with the impacts from other worldwide government and commercial launches.

Alternative 2 includes placing defensive interceptors in space, which involves adding additional structures in space for an extended period of time. The International Space Station was determine to be an action that is international in scope that has a purpose of placing structures in space for an extended period of time; therefore, the impacts of the use of space-based weapons platforms were considered cumulatively with the impacts of the International Space Station.

The next few slides provide broad summaries of the impact analysis by the BMDS components and Test Integration for Alternatives 1 and 2, a No Action Alternative and the Cumulative impacts for Alternatives 1 and 2. Please note the results are extremely high level, suitable for this presentation. Additional details have been provided in some of the posters in the back room in the hallway. And, also, the impact analysis may be found in the Executive Summary Impact Tables and in Section 4 of the Draft PEIS.

It's important to note that no environmental showstoppers were found in the Programmatic Envi4ronmental Impact Analysis. As the next few slides show, there are

potential impacts associated with the various activities needed to implement the BMDS; however, they would be appropriately addressed in subsequent tiered NEPA analyses along with the mitigation actions, as required, to ensure less than significant impacts.

This slide shows the summary of the broad potential for environmental impacts associated with the BMDS weapons activities, as examined, for each resource area for Alternatives 1 and 2. Please note, this is a very high-level depiction of the results of the analysis. And additional details of the weapons analysis can be found in the tables of the Executive Summary and the Draft PEIS. However, one can see from this slide the general activities and resource areas that should be considered in subsequent tiered NEPA analyses.

This slide shows the impact summary for the BMDS sensor components. Note the impacts are the same for Alternatives 1 and 2 and include space-based sensor platforms. This summary also shows how MDA characterization of activities helps to simplify the analysis. For example, the activation of the radars would not impact air quality because the only emissions resulting from radars would be from supporting diesel generators, which are addressed under support assets. However, radars generate electromagnetic radiation which

could potentially impact biological resources.

Although C2BMC is the glue that enables the integrated BMDS to function effectively as a system, this component creates little potential for environmental impact.

Impacts associated with support assets are mainly those that would be caused by site-preparation and construction of the infrastructure and by using test assets such as countermeasures and simulants during testing.

Test integration overall has the most potential for impact because it includes the use of several components during increasingly realistic test scenarios. Although this programmatic analysis shows the potential for impact, the existing environment of the post-test location of the specific test activities plan would determine the nature and extent of the impact.

The No Action Alternative would continue the development and testing of individuals weapons, sensors, C2BMC and support assets and would not include integration testing of these components. The environmental impact of the No Action Alternative would be the same as the impact resulting from continued development and testing of the individual missile defense elements. The decision not to deploy a fully integrated BMDS could

result in the inability to respond to a ballistic missile attack on the U.S. or its deployed forces, allies or friends in a timely and successful manner.

Further, this alternative would not meet the purpose or the need of the proposed action or the specified direction of the President or the United States Congress.

We examined the impact of the worldwide launches for cumulative impacts. Launches can create cumulative impacts by contributing to global warming and ozone depletion. Central launch emissions that could affect global warming include carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide, which is CO2. Unlike C02, carbon monoxide is not a greenhouse gas; it can contribute indirectly to the greenhouse gas effect. Cumulative impact on global warming of emissions from BMDS launches would be insignificant compared to other industrial sources, such as energy generation.

The BMDS launch emission load of C02 and carbon monoxide would only be 5 percent of the emission loads for worldwide launches. In addition, C02 and carbon monoxide in 10 years of BMDS and worldwide launches combined would account for much less than 1 percent of C02 and carbon monoxide emissions from U.S. industrial sources in a single year.

Chlorine is a primary concern with respect to ozone

depletion. Launches are one of the man-made sources of chlorine in the stratosphere. The cumulative impacts of stratospheric ozone depletion from launches would be far below the effect caused by natural and man-made sources. The emission loads of chlorine from both BMDS and other launches worldwide occurring between 2004 and 2014 would account for half of 1 percent of the industrial chlorine load from the U.S. in a single year.

The orbital debris produced by BMDS activities would be generally small in size and consist primarily of launch vehicle hardware, old satellites, and bolts and paint chips. It may also be possible for debris from an intercept to become orbital debris. However, orbital debris produced by BMDS activities would occur in low Earth orbit where debris would gradually drop into successively lower orbits and eventually reenter the atmosphere; therefore, orbital debris from BMDS activities would not pose a long-term hazard to the International Space Station or other orbiting structures.

In addition, collision avoidance measures would further reduce the potential for orbiting debris to damage structures in space such as the International Space Station.

I'd like to reiterate that our impact analysis indicated no showstoppers or expected areas of significant

impact. However, many resource areas showed potential for impact indicating these areas need to be considered in subsequent analyzed analysis tiered from the PEIS.

Now, I'd like to turn the meeting back over to Peter who will talk about the administrative process and how we're going to take the public comments.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Marty. Now that we've looked at the proposed BMDS and the potential impacts of implementation, let's discuss the PEIS schedule.

The Notice of Intent was released April 11 of 2003 in the Federal Register. The MDA released the Draft PEIS in September 2004.

The public comment period, which we're in right now, will continue through November 17, 2004. After that time the MDA will consider all comments received and incorporate appropriate changes into the Final PEIS. A release date for the Final PEIS is estimated between December and January 2004 -- 2005.

After release of the Final PEIS, there will be a 30-day waiting period before the MDA can issue the Record of Decision or ROD. I think that is our last acronym.

There are a number of ways in which you can provide comments on the Draft BMDS PEIS. You can provide your comments orally or in writing. Oral and written comments will be given equal consideration in the Final PEIS. If

you would like to make a public statement at tonight's meeting, please sign up at the registration table and fill out a speaker's card during the break.

Each speaker will be given five -- or three minutes to make a statement, as mentioned earlier. Public statements by tonight's speakers will be recorded by a court reporter to ensure that we accurately capture your comments on the Draft PEIS. There is also a toll-free telephone number that you can use to submit comments.

Please refer to the handouts you've got for the toll-free telephone number. Another option is to submit your comments in writing. There are four ways to do that. You may leave your written comments with us if you brought them with you. Second, you can use the comment forms available at the registration table to write down your comments and also leave those with us. You can either turn them in tonight or fax them to us. Third, you can email your comments to MDA at the email address listed on the screen. Finally, you can submit your comments through the PEIS website on an electronic form we have.

Again, to ensure your comments are adequately considered in the Final BMDS PEIS, they must be received no later than November 17.

The information on the screen lists the various ways you can submit comments. Information is also listed on

the comment forms on the registration table, the MDA PEIS website, and the handouts near the posters. Please visit the BMDS PEIS website for additional information. The website provides the descriptions of the topic areas we touched on this evening, as well as links pertaining to additional information. The materials handed out tonight are posted on the BMDS PEIS website.

We encourage you to sign up for the hard copies of the Executive Summary of the Final PEIS and the CD-ROM containing the entire document when it becomes available. To do this, please fill out the appropriate forms at the registration table. You can also request a copy of the Executive Summary or CD-ROM of the entire document by sending us an email, again, at the address listed on the screen.

The Final PEIS will be also be available in pdf format to download from the website and hard copies will be placed in local libraries. A list of these libraries is available on the website.

Marty, final comments?

MR. DUKE: Again, our role here tonight is to provide you the opportunity to address your concerns firsthand so we can consider those in the preparation of the Final PEIS.

Remember, no decisions on this project will be made tonight. But you -- we do want to make sure you have the

opportunity to provide us the comments. Again, please provide comments in the various methods that Peter explained. I think there is a handout with all of that information you can pick up and take with you but we need the comments and request they be submitted no later than November 17th(sic).

Now we are going to take about a 10 to 15-minute break to set up for the public statements period. You can sign up at the registration table if you'd like to make a public comment.

After the public comments period we'll be available back at the poster areas to answer any further questions you may have. Okay.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Also, if you didn't sign up when you first came in, even if you are not making a public comment, if you could sign up at the front table.

Thank you.

(Brief recess taken from 7:11 p.m. to 7:26 p.m.)

MR. BONNER: Let's come back together and let's get started.

Can you take your seats, please. I have the list of registered speakers and I'll call each person to the microphone to speak.

Again, please limit your remarks to three minutes.

To help you keep track of time, after about two and a half minutes I'll hold up this very professionally done sign and you'll know you need to wrap up.

If you do have a written version of your comments, we ask you provide that to us so we can accurately keep a record of your statements. When providing your public comments, remember to state your name and your affiliation as clearly as possible so we can pick it up as we record the meeting.

If you don't wish to give an oral statement tonight, please take advantage of the many opportunities we've tried to lay out for you to make other comments.

With that, let's start. Alan Stahler. Is it Stahler or Staler(phonetic)?

ALAN STAHLER: Stahler. My name is Alan Stahler. I live in Nevada City, California. The World Trade Center towers were not taken down --

MR. BONNER: One second. Two, three --

ALAN STAHLER: My name is Alan Stahler. I live in Nevada City, California. The World Trade Center towers were not taken down by ballistic missiles. The USS Cole was not attacked by ballistic missiles. The Federal Building in Oklahoma City was not destroyed by ballistic missiles. Any country knows that we know that they know that we know that any launch of a limited ballistic

missile attack, as described in the handout we got today, would be suicidal.

They know that we know that they know we know their country would be dust in an hour of any such attack. The handouts says four-fifths of the tests of the system so far were interceptions. I realize that that depends on what your definition of what "interception" is; but in most of the world, almost only applies in horseshoes. I'd like to know what would be the environmental effect, the environmental impact if the system is deployed but does not work?

What are the immediate effects to the environment in which we live? What are the effects of our environment on how we live on diverting financial resources? The handouts didn't say anything about what this would cost now or in the future. What are the effects on our environment of diverting the intellectual resources that could go to better places? What are the environmental effects of diverting skilled work that could be applied to building schools, libraries, roads, bridges, you name it?

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Miles Everett.

MILES EVERETT: Thank you all for this opportunity. My name is Miles Everett. I'm from Healdsburg, California. I'm involved with the Alliance for Democracy and that is what brings me to these particular concerns.

I, too, am concerned about a broader definition of environment. And one of the things that concerns me a great deal about this present project is that the technical environment for making it work does not seem to be up-to-speed. The Union of Concerned Scientists says that the project that is about to be launched has no assurance of working at all. And Thomas Christy, who is the head of one of the testing agencies of the Pentagon, says he has no assurance that the part of the system about to be deployed would even protect Alaska against a missile from North Korea.

I'm also concerned about the financial environment. Apparently, a hundred billion dollars has been spent thus far. 10 billion more is asked for 2005; another 53 billion for 2004 and 2009. The layered project, I would suggest, is a kind of a cover for a blank check, which will keep us paying for these weapon systems until we're all gone.

We have a huge deficit. We have many demands and yet they want to dig that deficit hole much deeper by this particular project. What about the environment for international relations? What is world opinion to make of this situation where the United States charges ahead because it's rich enough to -- to try to build an umbrella which protects it, at the same time it announces its

policies of preemptive war.

We already had one comment from an Iranian general who said, "Well, clearly, if you're going to be dealing with the United States in the future, you have to have nukes or you can't even get their attention."

What about American opinion? The idea that somehow we'll be safer under this umbrella, which will be sold -- you can imagine -- the Whitehouse and the Pentagon will sell this idea right off the face of the earth that now we're going to be safe under this umbrella.

I thought that I heard a number of times from this Administration that 911 changed everything. And it ought to have changed this 21-year-old strategy that goes back to the Cold War before we had a great many of the satellite surveillance systems and so forth that cover the entire globe that make it impossible for anybody to set up without us knowing about it and be able to follow the process.

MR. BONNER: You've got about 30 seconds.

MILES EVERETT: It does not do anything, obviously, to address the great multitude of threats that have been so much talked about since 911. It's simply a huge distraction from our real problems of learning how to live on this globe with all of the people on the globe. And the implications -- finally, the implications of

destroying missiles, which presumably would be nuclear armed missiles, destroying them in flight and suggesting that is a worthy desirable objective is a -- that is a very dubious proposition.

They will tell you that the nuclear warhead does not necessarily explode. But certainly the technology that can create this mammoth system can also create a system which would cause a nuclear warhead to explode when and if it's intercepted.

So we have warheads going off around the globe wherever we happen to intercept it. That does not create a very attractive environment for human beings.

MR. BONNER: Robert Alpern.

ROBERT ALPERN: Good evening everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to have citizens' comments.

I think we've said that the environment is much broader than what this statement calls for. The environment is a social and cultural environment that we need to take into consideration as we consider building such a new and costly provocative system.

The National Intelligence Estimate of 2001 for the Bush Administration says, and I quote, An attack on U.S. territories is more likely to be -- we are more likely to be attacked by countries or terrorists by using ships, trucks, airplanes or other means, rather than long-range

ballistic missiles.

We're still in the era of the Cold War in thinking about these missiles and this program to create this artificial and flawed umbrella for the people of this country. What are the effects on other countries of this provacative system? It is thought likely that China will increase its production of nuclear weapons to overwhelm this system, which is very easily overwhelmed by decoys and numbers. This system, as we now know it, is meant to ideally knock out a very few incoming missiles, not at all the kind of attack that possibly could occur. It is flawed in that respect.

The Pentagon itself in an analysis called the Ballistic Missile Defense System, a Case Study Against Rushing Forward on a Missile System. The Pentagon itself said that. And yet we're -- we have spent a hundred billion dollars. We're planning to spend 83 billion more over the next ten years and we have nothing to show for it except neglected communities, depleted healthcare systems and actual environmental neglect of the real environments that we all daily live in.

This proposal that we're asked to address tonight does not contain a real No Option Alternative not to build the system, to abandon it. That is what I think most of the people in the United States and the world would

affirm.

This system's impact on traditional arms control and disarmament efforts would be profound. We've already vitiated the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty under this Administration. We're preparing to resume nuclear weapons testing at the Nevada test site. We're building a whole series of new nuclear weapons, the mini nukes and bunker buzzards.

We're prepared to fight preemptive wars and yet this antiquated system that is going to cost you and I and our fellow Americans the treasures of our society that are already depleted by the Iraq war and other weapons spending, we're asked to do this. And I say we must abandon this program and utilize our resources in more constructive ways and practicing the ways of diplomacy negotiations and building alliances, instead of acting unilaterally, which is what this program does.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Karen Blomquist.

KAREN BLOMQUIST: Hi. I'm a nurse and I therefore know the difference between preventive care and just treating the symptoms.

Star Wars just treats the symptoms of aggression. And like most efforts to treat the symptoms, while ignoring the real problem, these efforts will make the

problem worse. As an example, taking an aspirin for a headache, which is a symptom of an impending stroke, is not going to help the problem.

Star Wars is an aggressive move that will only foster aggressive feelings and eventually aggressive actions from other countries. Continuing to bully other countries around is not going to win us alliances. It does just the opposite. Most countries, if not all, will end up hating us. And as it fosters this aggressive action, Star Wars will clog up the space over our Earth. The consequences of which we do not fully know.

Like food additives that are now found to cause -- or possibly cause mood disorders and ADD, what might clogging up the space surrounding Earth with satellites and debris do? While we shoot more satellites up into air spewing perchlorate into our atmosphere, how much of our ozone will be left to protect all life from destruction of the sun's rays?

If the satellites break and accidentally misfire or fire on their own, how many satellite or accidental misfires will it take before World War III?

Star Wars is an action of those who do not -- do not live in reality but live in some -- but live in some self-centered devil worshipping dream world of control that will ultimately cause the rest of us who live in a

nightmare of terror, while destroying the very Earth upon which we live.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Karen. MacGregor Eddy.

MACGREGOR EDDY: Hi. I came here from Salinas to speak on this. And in Salinas they're proposing closing all of our public libraries. Why? Because they don't have enough money.

Well, where is the money going? I propose that 1.3 trillion dollars for Star Wars is a good example of where the money is going. Closing all of the public libraries completely in a town that is 66 percent Hispanic American, in a town that produces 80 percent of the lettuce you eat.

Let's take a look at what the program is. And I'll address it environmentally. I have copies of my statements if anybody wants it. Here you go. Here. Pass them around.

Statements from MacGregor Eddy. I'm an advisory board member of the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space regarding the Programmatic Impact Statement of the PEIS Ballistic Missile System presented October 19th, Sacramento, California.

One, the 515 launches which is far more than the 99 commercial launches that are proposed. By the way, I came here expecting a fairly honest presentation of the PEIS and I was shocked at the scummy lies I heard by people I

regard as honest people. It's ridiculous that the -- there is 515 launches proposed for Star Wars. That is five times the amount that would be launched under the programs that are non-Star Wars. And you can look this up for yourself. Don't trust me. Check it out.

The second thing is the PEIS is based on the Star Wars program as proposed -- and here we have a statement. Okay. This statement was made by General Henry Tray Obering. He's the head of the Missile Defense Agency. So this is not a statement from some conspiracy website. This is a statement from the head of the MDA. What did he say when he was speaking at a Homeland Security conference on a missile defense panel on October 13th in Colorado Springs, Colorado? He was asked about the THAAD, which is the Theater High Altitude Defense Missiles that are scheduled to go into production in 2005. He was asked about these.

What did General -- General Henry Tray Obering say about the missiles? He said, quote, These missiles are intended to augment, not replace, the current generation of ground-based midcourse interceptors.

That is what we're talking about here tonight, ground-based midcourse interceptors. In fact, there will be a continued spiraling of the capabilities of missile network with more missiles and additional sites added to

the current missiles and expansion of the Theater High Altitude Defense Missiles beyond the initial scheduled 25 missiles. Therefore -- hey, listen. Therefore, the program they're talking about includes far more missiles than the ones they're proposing.

The second thing is the PEIS does not evaluate the environmental impact of No Action Alternative; thus, does not comply to the National Environmental Policy Act.

And three, the PEIS does not address the environmental impact of the response to ballistic missile defense systems by other countries. For example, China is planning to increase the number of missiles they have in direct response to our ballistic missile program. And this PE -- this Environmental Impact Report does not address the effect of testing, deployment and decommissioning of these two missiles in China, which is a direct result of our policy. And this is not included in the Environmental Impact Report.

The report -- since No Action Alternative was not considered seriously in the impact report, I say it is not an impact report at all. Therefore, it has not complied with the legal requirements; therefore, it should be stopped.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Rod Macdonald.

ROD MACDONALD: I'm Rod Macdonald. I'm a professional wetland scientist. I work with identifying wetland ecosystems, their components, soils, water quality, their functionality. I modify them, restore them, recreate them under occasion, so forth. So I know what I'm talking about. I'm a registered wetland scientist, which means, like a structural engineer, Im educated. But I have a reputation to lose, if I don't get the facts right.

I guess what disturbs me is I read Science Magazine. It comes out 52 times a year. It's uncensored. You'd be surprised of the things you'll see in there. Anyway, there is a lot of discussion about missile systems that comes from the point of view of the National Academy of Science. And, of course, there is a broad range of opinions of scientists, like anyone else. It's sort of a scientific engineer-based discussion.

I want to talk about what an Environmental Impact Statement is supposed to be under the NEPA, National Environmental Quality Act. It's supposed to look at a cradle-to-grave analysis of a project. It's supposed to minimize the impact at every state, in every level, every decision within it.

I really think it's a great thing to take a program like this which has a huge cumulative impact and look at

it in a systematic cumulative way. That's what it says it does; but, unfortunately, it's not what it does. It provides a false set of figures upon which to compare what the real impacts would be. Instead of trying to look at where we have to go if we want to deploy the system -- I'm not willing to take a stand about whether I agree the system should or shouldn't be built. I think despite all terrorism, the possibility of a missile launched from a disguised container off of the coast is realistic and we'll never know who put it in that container but we'll need to shoot it down.

But my argument isn't with the waste of money, if it may be an overblown system or its provocative nature; but, instead, it really does not address what is going on. And the reason it doesn't is it provides -- I'll look at perchlorates. Perchlorates are important to amphibians. Amphibians are in a worldwide decrease.

If you look at the report, all the report ever says is "hazardous waste will be handled and dispersed in accordance with appropriate regulations; therefore, no significant hazardous materials and hazardous waste impact will be expected."

They go through and they say this for every single thing. The vegetation and so forth won't be or "we'll do a tiered-site analysis and a certain site will be

affected" but it won't. But the truth is over the decade life of the program, the global level of perchlorates may rise. Amphibians skin needs to be moist. They're very sensitive to all industrial chemicals. 70 percent of the species are in decline right now, even in habitats that aren't disturbed.

Why would we care about them? The mosquitos are coming out. We don't have hard figures. We don't have real analysis. We're told this is a half a percent. What they're disguising there is most of the chemicals are residual from former manufacturing processes. And even so, the largest contributor -- as a scientist, I'm simply telling you, the largest contributor actually is the manufacturing, testing, open detonation of old rocket motors and the whole thing.

Just to say there would be no impact -- this is a negative deck. We've all seen negative decks. They go through and check off negative deck. Negative deck. Negative deck. This isn't an honest -- this isn't a scientific discussion. I'm aware of what NEIR is. I've dealt with them for 25 years.

Thanks.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Jimmy Spearow.

JIMMY SPEAROW: Thank you. The -- the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Take a deep breath, Jimmy.

JIMMY SPEAROW: The PEIS underplays many environmental effects of the BMDS. The Ballistic Missile -- I'm sorry. The Ballistic Missile Defense System PEIS does not address several of my scoping comments to start with and does not adequately address several risks, including exposure to increased levels of toxic pollutants from a dramatic increase of missile launches.

As we know, the -- the perchlorates are used in the self-propellants in the formation of a key thyroid hormone which are critical for growth and development of fetuses and children. The PEIS proposes to allow over thirty-fold higher levels of perchlorate at 200 parts per billion than proposed by the State of California, which is six parts per billion. Thus, many rocket launches will inject chemicals including aluminum oxide, hydrogen chloride and hydrochloric acid directly into the upper atmosphere, thereby depleting the ozone.

The PEIS does not address the direct injection of the chemicals high into the atmosphere. Secondly, the BMDS PEIS underestimates the risk of health and safety of BMDS missiles accidentally shooting down civilian and/or friendly military aircraft.

BMDS has failed to mention the U.S. missile systems have a history of accidentally shooting down aircraft.

Consider the U.S. has seen the Pac-3 missiles, which are -- which are in the PEIS, actually shot down several U.S. and allied jets -- two or three in this case of -- I'm sorry -- in two of the cases of the recent invasion of Iraq. There is also Flight TWA 800. And even though several people saw streaks going up toward it, the people that saw it were never allowed to testify.

The -- the point is that the activation of the BMDS risk accidentally shooting down civilian airliners is not even considered in the BMDS. It's a risk to health and safety. While the BMDS states that warning will be provided to enable time to clear the air space, it's highly doubtful that such time would be allowed in such an emergency.

Also, the PEIS underestimates the effects of space to reach from high altitude midcourse missile intercepts in the destruction of satellites, particularly at high altitude.

Furthermore, while the PEIS considers testing the BMDS on targets of opportunity, no mention is of the space debris resulting from U.S. targets of opportunity or other nations' targets of opportunity. The environmental consequences of mini rocket launches needed to deploy and maintain space-based interceptors has not been adequately considered, nor has its environmental consequences of the

fuel. They talk about having all of the -- these -- in other words, in Option 2, they have many different interceptors in space that would have a reduced environmental consequence. But there's no consideration you have to launch all of those missiles in the place to get there.

Also, will the space-based satellites use nuclear power sources? Will any BMDS interceptors use nuclear warheads? This was not clearly defined. This is unsatisfactory. The BMDS does not include a real No Action Alternative. Such an alternative does not include further development and testing and deployment of these weapon systems needs to be considered and included in the PEIS. The PEIS does not consider a No Action Alternative at all. In other words, something that would involve rejoining the UN and -- and many other nations of the world in order to enhance security through treaties and arms control, sovereign approaches; i.e., approaches that provided us with long-term security to date.

Also, the PEIS, has not considered any -- has not considered any radioactive follow-up from interceptive missiles. The effects of war are not excluded for the analysis of NEPA. However, the proposed BMDS action is likely to promote a worldwide weapons of mass destruction arms race and force other nations to prepare a massive

retaliation against the U.S., should war ensue.

Since the proposed BMDS is very likely to cause a massive arms race, the environmental consequences of a resulting war with nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction should not be ignored.

The PEIS needs to consider the environmental effects that follow up from interceptive weapons of mass destruction, as well as effects of weapons of mass destruction the BMDS fails to intercept. This needs to be considered relative to a true No Action Alternative.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Pallo Deftereos.

PALLO DEFTEREOS: I'm Pallo Deftereos, Chairman of the Sacramento Committee for Nuclear Arms Control. I oppose national missile defense, not primarily because it is a near-term threat to our environment but because it threatens human survival.

My concerns are shared by many senior military officers, Nobel Laureate scientists and diplomats. I've been collecting literature on the nuclear weapons issue for over 20 years. Fred Takikowa of my committee will give you an envelope containing a sample of my collected literature. I gave your agency some of the same articles at last year's hearing.

My combined total of employment with the State and

Federal government was almost 40 years. So I know how government works. My differences are not with the MDA representatives who are here tonight. They are instead with Federal decision-makers at a far higher level than these gentlemen.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Dan Bacher. Do you want to use the hand-held mic, Dan?

DAN BACHER: Does not matter. Where is that? Yeah.

Hi. I'm Dan Bacher, Central American Action Committee member and long-time environmental and peace activist. And I suggest an Alternative Number 4, which means scrap the entire PEIS and the whole program that they are presenting here.

This is a colossal waste of taxpayers money that could be spent on just about anything else other than this and it would be productive. There is a hundred billion dollars that have been spent and another 83 billion that are planned to be spent over the ten years if this Star Wars goes into effect.

The crazy thing about this is there is no imminent threat of weapons of mass destruction or space weapons at least on Earth. I have three questions that I'd like included in the comment period of the document.

Number 1, are we afraid of the zany folks from

Zetaraticuli from launching ballistic missiles at Washington, D.C.? Are we terrified of the peaceful and highly evolved inhabitants of Europa from launching WMD's at New York? Number 3, are we afraid of the wonderful civilization of the third planet from Orion launching a massive terrorist attack here on us in Sacramento? No. I don't think so. Unless the government isn't telling us something about this.

Who are we protecting ourselves against?

Okay. What I think that -- a better thing than calling this all of the acronyms that have been given out here on this wonderful PowerPoint presentation, I think it could be summed up as "Lost in Space."

The people that came up with the Star Wars technologies whole concept are out of their minds. This is the ultimate corporate welfare project.

You know, I -- I'd like to conclude with the fact that we -- we need to get rid of this whole Star Wars project and the PEIS and everything else and get the weapons contractors off welfare.

And when I've been out demonstrating I get this stuff from people, "Why don't you get a job?" Well, I've had a job for years. You know, I've been employed the whole time. What I'd like to say to the people that are proposing Star Wars and the Missile Defense System is to

get a job, weapons contractors.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Dan. Bill Durston.

BILL DURSTON: Dan is a hard act to follow. Anyway, turning some of the comments that have already been made relating back to the Environmental Impact Report, the Environmental Impact Report has to consider the chain reactions. The report on cutting down old growth Redwoods considers the effect it will have on the spotted owl. The Ballistic Missile Defense program will have effect on a lot more than just spotted owls.

It's not only a likelihood, it's a certainty that other countries will react to us developing a Ballistic Missile Defense System, however flawed it might be. And they will react likely by developing more ballistic missiles to overcome the defense system. I've seen nothing in the environmental report on this system that takes into account how other countries will react.

So the effects of the more missile launches, more rocket fuel contaminates going into the water, more depletion of the ozone are not just those of the Ballistic Missile System being described here. All of the effects of the proliferation of ballistic missiles around the world must also be considered in a serious Environmental Impact Report.

Similarly, with the weaponization of space it has

been mentioned that other countries are unlikely to be able to afford similar space-based interceptors. Well, the fact is, the U.S. cannot afford this system either. Nevertheless, it wouldn't take much money to send satellites into space to purposely explode and create space debris that would make the space-based interceptors ineffectual and would also make the communication satellites ineffectual and so on and so forth, basically, sabotage space for military and civilian use.

This should be considered quite seriously in an Environmental Impact Report on this system. I don't see any consideration of that. That would be a very simple way another country could stop the whole system.

You know the alternative. This has been alluded to. The alternative has to be considered. The alternative of land, sea, air and space-based defense systems are being considered. The alternative of a diplomacy-based defense system is not considered. In fact, diplomacy seems to be a -- a foreign concept to the current Administration.

But as we now know, UN weapons inspections work quite well to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. And similar systems could be deployed around the world, as was deployed in Iraq, and eliminated all of the weapons of mass destruction. These might not meet the needs of Congress, the President and the likes of Dick Cheney and

those with egregious economic conflicts of interest, as Dan alluded; but they would meet the needs of the American people.

Talk about showstoppers. This Ballistic Missile System is a threat to the survival of all living species on Earth. That is a very definite showstopper.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Mr. Jaskowski.

HELEN JASKOWSKI: I'm not Mr. Jaskowski.

MR. BONNER: Sorry about that.

HELEN JASKOWSKI: My name is Helen Jaskowski and I live in San Pedro. I have to leave in a few minutes because we have to take a bus back to our campground.

I want to -- and Jonathan Paatrey from the Physicians for Social Responsibility will take up whatever time may be left from mine.

I am responding to the first paragraph here, the need for missile defense. In 1973 I was a Fulbright lecturer at a university in Poland. This was the Cold War. I lived behind the Iron Curtain and was sent back there several times more by the government to do teaching.

Would I have felt safer with this kind of system in place at that time with those threats? No, of course not; neither I, nor the people I lived among in Poland, nor the people I came home to here.

This statements says this thing is needed to protect ourselves, our allies and our friends. Does not name who the allies and friends are. We have fewer and fewer of them as every day passes. And this system will destroy any that are remaining.

MR. BONNER: Dorothy Houston.

DOROTHY HOUSTON: My name is Dorothy. I live in Los Angeles. I'm a citizen and taxpayer. Thanks, Mr. Graham, for having us here.

I'm opposed to the BMDS because the system would create a new arms race. Nuclear states will develop faster, smarter weapons and faster, smarter weapons delivery systems. It's only in videogames that the U.S. could protect itself from nuclear conflagration.

I'm opposed to the BMDS because it would undermine any effort at multi-lateral nuclear weapons disarmament and summarily wipe away any U.S. credibility in encouraging non-nuclear states to stay that way.

I'm opposed to the BMDS because it would result in a vast waste of money that could be spent on pursuing real nuclear security, such as supporting the former Soviet Republic in securing, controlling and decommissioning their nuclear materials. Even the money spent giving the Boy Scouts tours of hardware at Vandenberg Air Force Base could be used by Russian scientists and physicists to help

protect us all.

Star Wars is a dangerous, destabilized and expensive fantasy. Spend my tax dollars on something that will protect me, my family and amphibians and the Boy Scouts from ultimate environmental issue nuclear holocaust.

MR. BONNER: Jim Lingburg.

JIM LINGBURG: Thank you. Hi. I'm Jim Lingburg. I'm the Legislative Advocate for the Friends Committee on Legislation in California here in Sacramento. Thank you very much for giving me a few minutes to address you all here today. Excuse me.

Rather than extending the arms race into space is we believe that the only way to reduce the threat of war and violence is by addressing the social and material conditions under which we live, reducing those inequities that make war and terrorism attractive options. We spend twice as much on militarization as the rest of the world combined. Can we honestly say that has made us safer?

We were unable to stop 19 men with boxcutters. Since 1983 we've spent a hundred and thirty billion dollars for missile defense. The Administration wants to spend 10 billion dollars this year. We have a letter from 49 retired military generals. If you go to the Center for -- the Center For Arms Control of Non-proliferation, if you go to their website, there is a letter from 49

retired military generals asking President Bush to not spend this money on missile defense, to divert resources to protecting our ports from weapons of mass destruction that could make it into the country.

They also say U.S. technology already deployed can pinpoint the source of a ballistic missile launch. It is therefore highly unlikely any state would dare to attack the U.S. or allow a terrorist to do so from its territory with a missile armed with a weapon of mass destruction, thereby risking annihilation from a devastating U.S. retaliatory strike.

We would note that militarization consumes 50 percent of our Federal tax dollars and our best scientists. Instead of throwing money down a drain or black hole, imagine what we could do if we had a Marshall Plan for the planet. This is the only way to make the planet safer. We need constructive, not destructive, solutions.

Diplomacy, disarmament and multi-lateralism as opposed to unilateralism is the answer.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Darien Delu.

DARIEN DELU: I'm Darien Delu. I'm connected with the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the United States section. It's an honor to get to speak to this body because of the other speakers who have come

before me, who have covered so many of the critical points that have to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

We have been presented with a document with 700 pages of inadequate information and sidestepping and general ignoring of the real issues involved. Many of these have been raised already tonight and I'll try not to be too redundant.

The -- NEPA provides for consideration of environmental impacts of the MDA proposals. The MDA PEIS finds only limited environmental consequences for the two proposed alternatives. The so-called No Action Alternative creates a straw dog against which to judge the first two alternatives of the MDA.

The focus of my comments will be two-fold. First, I call for a true No Action Alternative, as have others. For example, or specifically, an alternative that goes beyond the failure to integrate anti-ballistic missile system to an alternative that rejects the individual missile defense elements of a BMD System. Secondly, I point out the unaddressed global environmental impact of an accelerated arms race. Such acceleration, as has been repeatedly pointed out this evening, is entirely predictable as a consequence of the U.S. BMD program.

Because of the devastating impacts -- political,

environmental, ecological and psychological, as well as merely environmental -- the impacts of a Ballistic Missile Defense Program of any kind, this PEIS must address a true No Action Alternative. The failure of this PEIS to include such a true No Action Alternative violates the requirements of the NEPA process. The absence of a true No Action Alternative allows the PEIS to construct a false comparison with the other alternatives underplaying the different degrees of environmental damage.

According to the PEIS, the proposed action is needed to protect the U.S. from ballistic missile threats. However, the proposal as -- as a BMDS, a Ballistic Missile Defense System in English, will result in an acceleration of the global arms race.

As others have already pointed out, in the case of China, if the U.S. implements a BMDS, other countries will feel called upon to create or increase their missile-based weapons deployment systems as well as their nuclear armament in order to prevent -- in order to present themselves as credible negotiation parties with the U.S. and protect the survivability of their weapons.

As others have already pointed out, the PEIS fails to address the chilling possibilities and associated impacts of an accelerated arms race and its increased missile testing. We're not even talking about the devastation a

war would cause.

And what about nuclear proliferation? The PEIS does not address the many environmental impacts of the entire nuclear cycle connected to nuclear proliferation. The PEIS points out NEPA excludes from consideration the environmental impact of a nuclear war or any acts of war. But as human beings, we cannot exclude that in our considerations.

MR. BONNER: Ellen Schwartz.

ELLEN SCHWARTZ: Good evening. I'm Ellen Schwartz. I'm the Co-chair of the Sacramento branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. And I thank you for the opportunity to speak here.

We know from Gulf War I and the War on Terror and the test results to date for the components of the BMDS that the surgical precision with which U.S. weapons are guided makes them excellent instruments for destroying embassies, wedding parties and a hotels full of journalists. In other words, you honored military gentlemen have trouble hitting your backsides with both hands. If you're -- there, is no way that a kinetic weapon -- is that what you call it? -- hitting a missile with an arrow is going to be able to actually hit any significant number of incoming alleged threatening missiles. You're going to have to use nukes in order to get a broad enough range of

destruction to take out any of these alleged incoming threats from Alpha Centauri.

Are you going to test them? Are you going to talk about them in the PEIS? Are you going to talk about the environmental impact of testing nuclear weapons in the atmosphere? Or are you just going to lie in the PEIS and, you know, get it installed and say later, "Oops, we have to have nuclear warheads"?

The display outside the hall finds uniformly no significant impacts from any of the phases of the BMDS. Emissions will be disbursed by the wind. It's unlikely any animals will get in the way. Of course, no satellite has ever fallen out of orbit and no rocket vehicle has ever blown up on launch so there is no danger of anything ever going wrong.

Even on your own terms without considering the environmental impact of forcing China, Korea, Iran and everybody else in the world to build their own systems to protect themselves from ours, even without considering the possibility that any of these countries including us might use these systems, the BMDS is a disaster waiting to happen. Every weapon built, sited, tested or even decommissioned is a potential disaster.

Your three alternatives assume a program that is going to be implemented whether we do whatever we say

here. And the PEIS and this hearing is nothing than a legal formality. You have no true No Action Alternative; only build it together or build it a little bit at a time and don't test it together.

I'm a little offended that all you want to hear about is the environmental impact of this system; whereas the presentation talks about how we'll all be not safe if we don't build it. If the safety of our country from our alleged enemies is on the table, then so is the impact of causing a war.

What you should do in your own terms is to consider a true No Action Alternative, which is an analysis of the relative emissions of greenhouse gasses and space debris and toxic chemicals and radiation caused by either (A), blowing things up or (B), pursuing broader implementations of existing treaties, such as the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which would not produce any greenhouse gasses, any space debris and would not blind any animal or destroy any life on Earth.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Marjorie Boehm.

MARJORIE BOEHM: I'm another speaker for the Women's International League.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The microphone.

MARJORIE BOEHM: I'm another speaker for the Women's International League and I have the honor of reading the statement that was sent to us by our president, Sandra Silver.

The Women's International League is a 90-year-old-non-governmental organization that has worked tirelessly since its inception to put an end to war. We have supported the development of international institutions and international law and non-violent methods of conflict resolution that together could facilitate the coexistence of diverse nations and peoples on this planet. The MDA Draft PEIS seeks to answer to detrimental environmental effects of three alternative development plans.

We have found the answers disturbingly incomplete. We have also considered all three alternatives presented and have concluded that it would be dangerous and indeed disastrous for the future of our nation to proceed with any of them. It's impossible to comment on all of the details but we will be submitting additional comments.

First, we are convinced that Alternative 2, which includes the development of space-based interceptors, is completely unacceptable. We will submit additional comments on both the issue of debris from experiments with space-based weapons and on the development of laser

weapons.

I'm skipping a little but -- and we have extra copies of this report. So we'll be glad to share them with you. We believe Alternative 1, which does not include space-based weapons and Alternative 3, which is unclear on this point, are also unacceptable.

Even from a solely environmental viewpoint, we're concerned about the adverse effects in all of the resource areas discussed in the PEIS, including hazardous waste, legal restraint, decommission, destruction of the ozone layer, global warming and rocket fuel solution.

We also wonder why this expensive and almost certainly unachievable missile defense program has been developed in the first place.

It does not answer to probable threat to our national security in the present or in the coming decade. It will do nothing to prevent terrorist attacks. And now there is no hostile country or group with the capability of firing intercontinental ballistic missiles at the United States.

Missile defense seems rather to be preparation for future confrontation with the only two countries really capable of threatening our current military domination or challenging us with nuclear attack. Neither China nor Russia is currently an enemy but this aggressive program may well push them into organizing allies and forces

against our own threat of global and planetary domination.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Ali Hosseinion.

ALI HOSSEINION: I'm Ali Hosseinion. I am an American Iranian -- I'm an American Iranian and I'm really scared in this country. Because this Environmental Impact Report was really just like a third world country Environmental Impact Report. They made it. They approved it. And four locations in the United States are like this, are gathering to say and voice their opinion. That is really a shame. Hundreds of billions of dollars spending and then only handful are here with no budget to look at it and no time to oppose it.

Shame on me. Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Jeanie Keltner.

JEANIE KELTNER: I'm Jeanie Keltner, a Professor Emeritus of English and editor of the progressive paper here in town.

I'm sad to say I'm speaking with a deep sense of futility today calling for a true No Action Alternative. A deep sense of futility because I don't believe this multi-billion dollar system can be stopped even by the passionate, eloquent informed people in this room who have come here on our own dime and our own time and spent many dimes and many hours working for peace and better ways to reconcile differences than the ones we see presented

tonight.

Too much money is going to too powerful entities to be stopped by any citizen's group I'm sad to say. But what has really struck me as we speak today is that we're really speaking such different languages. How I wish that we could communicate with each other because the PowerPoint presentation was so far, so different from the words that are being spoken here today in the room.

And how I believe that we are here all working for what we conceive of as the greater good. And it is so tragic that as we face the enormous challenge of global warming and peak oil and ozone depletion that we're going to waste the human capital and the financial capital on this poisonous boondoggle that doesn't even work.

You know, we in Sacramento are surrounded by the toxic mess the Department of Defense and its contractors have left behind. And the U.S. Government has even stopped cleaning up. The corporations long ago stopped cleaning up. The U.S. Government has stopped cleaning up. And I am certain that mothers have sat by the bedside of dying children because of the chemicals those children have ingested, the toxic cocktails. And that is not worth anything.

So I just wish it could be different.

MR. BONNER: Jonathan Paatrey. Jonathan, you've got

two extra minutes given by Ms. Jaskowski.

JONATHAN PAATREY: First, I would like to --

MR. BONNER: Can you turn it on?

JONATHAN PAATREY: Is it off? All right. Thank you.

First, I'd like to thank you, Colonel Graham and Mr. Bonner and Ms. Shaver and Mr. Duke for coming out here and -- and presenting your material and then hearing what the public has to share.

My comments are, I hope, going to be very specific and germane to the PEIS. One of the things I want to point out is that the -- our organization I represent is the Physicians for Social Responsibility in Los Angeles. We have about 5,000 members in Southern california. And we have actually worked with Lenny Segal and I believe you've heard his oral testimony as well as written documents regarding the perchlorate and the lack of information that is present in the PEIS.

Most notably, I would like to point out that the timeline of potentially releasing the final document but two weeks after the oral testimony, as well as what anyone else could offer in writing and -- or even six weeks later into -- in the end of January of '05 strikes me that you very well may not take too seriously what we have to say.

I would strongly suggest that you factor a time when you can actually take into account the things that the

public are suggesting.

I would like to offer some language for other alternatives which would entail a great deal of work on your part in the MDA office but I think it is absolutely necessary.

You're clearly aware of the political decisions that led to the formation of missile defenses, in general, coming out of a decision politically that deterrents were no longer sufficient. I feel that this Administration in making that determination is mistaken. But in addition to that, we haven't tethered out the differences in this document between strategic defense defenses against long-range missiles and those of an -- in a theater defenses. And all previous administrations had kept these two missile defenses segregated. And this Administration has blended the two. And I think to the detriment because theater defenses have actually a promising future, unlike strategic defenses.

Theater defenses can protect troops in the field. Theater defenses can protect cities from attack, overseas especially. And they have actually enjoyed some limited success both in the field of testing as well as in the battlefield and also enjoys bipartisan support.

There is actually a realistic threat. There are short-range and medium-range missiles that could actually

be fired in hostility at American targets or those allies; unlike the strategic long-range missiles which do not really have a basis in reality.

And in addition, theater defenses have a realistic success because the boost phase of a missile is relatively slow and even the descent of a short-range, medium-range missile is much slower than that of the strategic missile, which could be traveling at 10 kilometers per second, which makes it very unlikely to hit.

The alternative, it may be politically impossible for you to do this, but I think you should try to have another alternative which would simply be to keep the -- this is probably the presidential candidate John Kerry's position on these matters -- would be to move ahead on theater defenses but to maintain the strategic weapons that the missile defense is -- against long-range missiles to be held in research and development stage. And -- and that would be my suggestion for a true alternative.

The other thing I want to bring up is in regards to in the PEIS there is some statements in the effect that some of the space-based interceptors would be placed in geosynchronous orbit, which I believe is some 24,000 kilometers from Earth. To actually get a weapon from 24,000 kilometers out to what would be a low-Earth orbit or even a lower trajectory of a missile within 20 minutes

or half hour and do so accurately and to hit the missile is fantasy. And therefore I think the PEIS mischaracterizes any weapon that would be placed in geosynchronous orbit as being an anti-missile weapon. It should simply not be listed as a possibility. That would be -- well, you would be deploying an ASAT -- an anti-satellite weapon. And you should go through the process of actually fielding that before the public and have -- and take your hits for that if, indeed, you're doing that.

The same with the Airborne Laser. There is a very good probability that an Airborne Laser would never work in shooting down a missile in the boost phase and all tests indicate that. But it could be highly effective in a directed energy targeting on Earth for terrestrial targets. And you should be honest about what that weapon might also be used for. It would be helpful to actually not mask the true purposes of some of these weapons.

I believe there needs to be more hearings. The PEIS is insufficient in dealing with cumulative effects, especially in Southern California, as so many of our local contractors are working on the weapons systems. We're bearing the brunt of our environmental impacts of the laser weapon development and many of the rocket launches and the rockets that are being assembled for those

launches to launch these 515 launches that may take place over the next 10 years.

I also suggest that you get testimony from the National Recognizance Office, if you have not done so. I'm sure there are considerable concerns about military recognizance assets being false -- being harmed by space debris and --

MR. BONNER: Finish up.

JONATHAN PAATREY: Yes. Last but not least, I would also suggest that you conduct a space debris analysis, as you have sited in the PEIS, that there may be intercepts as high a 400 kilometers. That either you do testing at 400 kilometers, which is ill-advised because of the debris problem, but how would you know if the weapons work unless you conduct the tests? Or you should actually assume that the weapons won't work because you cannot conduct the tests at 400 kilometers above.

Thank you very much.

MR. BONNER: Michael Monasky.

MICHAEL MONASKY: So this is a show, as we have showstoppers. I'm confused. Well, actually, I -- I was confused by the glossary. It's five pages long and single spaced. And I haven't started yet.

The New York Times magazine two days ago asked Wlodzimierz Cimoszewicz, Poland's Foreign Minister to the

United States about Polish defense minister, Jerzy Szmajdzinski who recently announced plans to pull all 2500 Polish troops from Iraq next year. Cimoszewicz answered, "It's not true. Our minister of defense mentioned that we would like to end our mission at the end of 2005 but that is not the official position of the government." But when the Times asked Cimoszewics if he had met with the families of the 13 Polish soldiers who died in Iraq, Foreign Minister had replied, "No. I have not." The Polish government was officially represented by the minister of defense.

Which begs the question: Has the defense minister been demoted to coroner/chaplain or how many dead Poles does it take to end the U.S. war in Iraq? Furthermore, Polish Foreign Minister Cimoszewics confirmed the Times figure that 70 percent of Polish people oppose the U.S. war in Iraq.

What are we afraid of? The Polish public opinion? The so-called insurgent Iraqis taking up arms against U.S. corporate mercenaries like Cal F. Brown and Root and Halliburton? Ari Fleischer's so-called Operation Iraqi Liberation? That was the original term for this attack, O-I-L. Serves to liberate the resources under those inconvenient civilians impeding corporate access.

The Cold War is over but this fact does not deter the

Bush crime syndicate from heating things up. There is no peace dividend as it and any surplus saved in the 90's has been spent since the start of the millennium. The world is a decidedly more dangerous place because the Pentagon has run amuck spending half of our income taxes while mortgaging debt so far as our great grandchildren so it can build so-called "kill vehicles."

Meanwhile, the Pentagon mocks our democracy. It plans, tests, builds and imposes terrible weapons of mass destruction. The Pentagon goes through the motions pretending concern about the environment, holding meetings in far away places like Alaska, Hawaii, where 61 people appear; 15 speak forth; and 7 provide written comments representing 280 million U.S. citizens.

Even the congressional "Millionaire Boys Club" does not feign that kind of representative democracy. The Pentagon does not even care about the speaking and writing concerned citizens. Its Notice of Intent in the Federal Register states the weapons system in question will be used, quote, To defend the forces and territories of the U.S. allies and friends against all classes of ballistic missiles threats in all phases of flights. Which, I suppose, makes the people of the U.S. potential collateral damage.

I imagine the purveyors of the Pentagon portfolio

are like the characters in the Beatle's satirical song entitled, "Piggies": Lying, conniving, consuming everything in sight. They never see their evil behavior inflict pain and suffering upon other beings and upon the world. And to get their attention and change their behavior, what they need is a damn good whacking. Of course, the song is referring to spanking but the Pentagon and spenders can measure its whacking in body counts.

Here in California we analyze public projects and hold them to the test of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970. When the Pentagon wanted to build a biological nuclear and chemical testing, manufacturing and storage facility at McClellan, UC Davis and Rancho Saco, the community successfully challenged and stopped the bid even before it could be tested by CEQA. The community saw the proverbial writing on the wall. The plan was analyzed. We found it wanting.

MR. BONNER: 30 seconds.

MICHAEL MONASKY: It amazes me -- I have to make a comment, since you've decided to interrupt me here. I speak before city councils and boards of supervisors and they sit -- they sit up until 1:00 in the morning listening to people like me talk who prepare comments. I think it's extremely rude for you to stand there and time

us when we've prepared our comments and we've thought this through.

You might have come from Fairfax, Virginia but you know, I'm sorry if I cut into your tee time or anything. So I'm going to finish. I have two more pages. But I'd appreciate it if you would stop interrupting my comments and those others who have worked all day, like I did, and came here.

MR. BONNER: You're cutting in to the time of the others. There are ten other speakers.

MICHAEL MONASKY: No. No. We're cutting into your time. This is not the time of others. This is the others. We are -- are the others. We are the people and we're speaking here, sir. Let me finish without interruption.

Did I get to the spanking?

The body counts. Yes. Thank you. And I talked about the California Environmental Quality Act, of which I think is great -- well, I think it's good to have an Environmental Quality Act. It's weak but nonetheless it's there. Let me pick up where I was at. Here.

Anyway, the community saw the writing on the wall. The plan was analyzed and it was dropped but this -- the same is true of defending BM's. This PEIS reads like a negative declaration.

In case you have not heard, the Cold War is over. This is reason enough for the No Project Alternative CEQA style. It's time for demilitarizing the Pentagon. I'm partial to Helen Caldecott's suggestion that it be converted back to its original design as a hospital.

I recommend we just skip the testing, manufacture and storage steps for these weapons systems that are referred to in this EIS and cut to the quick and decommission them all. Take out their fuses and timers and igniters and hire clever chemists to convert their horrible toxins to safe use.

Further, since adults seem to muck things up in the State Department, we should pay and support a coterie of children as ambassadors of peace and reconciliation to all countries on Earth. No more foreign aide. No more foreign debt. The kids will figure it out from there. The spanking should continue upon Pentagon contractors until they change their behaviors. Meanwhile, rescind all Pentagon weapons contracts. No more bucks for bombs. The reason why the Pentagon thinks it needs these weapons systems is because the United States of America has neither learned how not to over consume the planet's resources or stop exploiting human labor. We must become men and women of conscience who believe in and practice trust and respect for one another.

The No Project Alternative, as in CEQA spares us and our planet's ecology while allowing our energies to be spent on truly productive human endeavors.

No showstoppers, eh? So this is a show. This PEIS is a non-responsive negative declaration.

Thank you very much for your time.

MR. BONNER: Just to clarify, we're willing to stay here as long as you like.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We came here on our own time. We payed our own fare to get here. I came from far away. Many came from far away. You are paid to be here. You got your fair pay to be here. You're put up by the government. We are not. Therefore, I think you should listen to us.

MR. BONNER: That is the purpose of this meeting. The reason for setting the time limits is not to restrict comments. The reason for setting the time is to respect your time and the time we have here. We're willing to spend as much time as you want to get your comments out. That is the reason behind the three minutes.

Leonard Fisher.

LEONARD FISHER: I'm Dr. Leonard Fisher, retired faculty member of medicine at UCLA and volunteer physician at the LA Free Clinic and a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility. I'm one of the groups that drove

through the rainstorm this morning to get up here so we could express our concerns about what is going on.

I'm going to limit it to the problems related to ground-based interceptors. The most tested but still woefully ill-performing technology to develop to thwart long-range ballistic missile attack is out of the midcourse interceptor. This weapons system is designed to intercept enemy missiles in space from ground platforms in Fort Greely, Alaska, Vandenberg Air Force Base in Southern California. The chemicals used in solid rocket propellant that would be used to launch the intercept missiles, the test missiles and especially the booster rockets that place related detection communication satellites in space would all use ammonium perchlorates as the oxidizing agent in the rocket fuel. The fuel would also contain highly toxic hydrazine compounds and nitrogen oxide.

In the news of late, the developmental toxin perchlorate has been found in many of our nation's drinking water sources. This chemical inhibits thyroid hormone creation and release. In low doses, perchlorate is presumed to decrease the intelligence potential of a developing fetus. In cases of more severe exposure, can cause frank retardation.

Additionally, once combusted and exposed to air moisture, perchlorates create hydrochloric acid, more

commonly known as "acid rain."

Further, rocket launches deliver hydrochloric acid in the upper atmosphere, which, in turn, chemically interact with the protective ozone layer. It is therefore fair to assume that an increase in rocket launches may correspondingly bring about additional cases of skin cancer.

Rocket fuel needs to be continually replenished. The disposal of solid rocket propellant through washing out, propelling or open burning, open detonation are some of the major sources of perchlorate contamination across the country.

None of these perchlorate-related issues are adequately addressed in the PEIS. I'd like to add one further comment regarding the meetings that have been held. Southern California is bearing a disproportionate impact of missile defense development and its effects on the environment. The midcourse interceptor is being tested and deployed at Vandenberg Air Force Base in Santa Barbara County.

The Airborne Laser is being tested at Edwards Air Force Base in Los Angeles County. The space-based and Airborne Lasers are being developed by Northrop Grumman in the South Bay and San Juan Capistrano. Lockheed Martin, Boeing and Raytheon are deeply involved in developing the

midcourse interceptors and other systems.

At a minimum, there should be additional hearings near the areas most effected by missile defense developing. There should also be an environmental health evaluation concerning cumulative impacts for military production, testing and deployment of missile defense systems compounded on top of past military use.

This evaluation should be done with an eye on disproportionate impacts on low-income communities of color.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Philip Coyle.

PHILIP COYLE: I'm Philip Coyle. I'm also from Los Angeles. The environmental process --

MR. BONNER: Raise the mic.

PHILIP COYLE: Is this better? I'm Philip Coyle. I'm also from Los Angeles. The environmental process described in this PEIS is not believable or trustworthy because the statement read by Mr. Duke tonight is already not being followed. Mr. Duke said if testing failed to show the system worked, the system would not go forward. But as we know, the system is already being deployed even though it has no demonstrative capability to work under realistic conditions.

To take a different example, the PEIS says and, I

quote, The Airborne Laser is currently the only -- emphasize only -- proposed BMDS element with a weapon using an air platform, closed quotes. However, the PEIS does not discuss another proposed BMDS element that would use air platforms; namely, interceptors fired from aircraft.

With respect to the No Action Alternative already mentioned by others, it does not describe a scenario where no action is taken. Rather, it describes a system where the Missile Defense Agency would continue existing development and deployment unabated under the No Action Alternative. And I quote the PEIS here, Individual systems would continue to be tested but would not be subjected to system integration tests, closed quotes.

This is hardly no action and allows for indeterminate missile defense program since -- to go back to quoting the PEIS, There are currently no final fixed architectures and no set operational requirements for the proposed BMDS, closed quotes.

Thus, even if MDA agreed to the No Action Alternative, it would not find its actions constrained for the foreseeable future.

And, finally, with respect to space-based interceptors, the PEIS is silent about the fact that missile defense would, for the first time, weaponize

space. While space is certainly militarized, it's not yet weaponized; that is, with attack weapons in space and with the chain reaction of a new arms race in space.

The PEIS does not adequately address the environmental impacts of the consequences of placing strike weapons in space.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Lara Morrison.

LARA MORRISON: I'm here from Los Angeles and my background is in bioethics and environmental science. And I feel like the PEIS provides an inadequate assessment of the environmental impacts. It does not allow the reader to compare the magnitude of the potential impacts or the degree of risks involved with the alternatives and with the elements of testing, deployment or not acting.

The proposed system will promote a false sense of security while preempting the use of resources to address real threats, global warming and peak oil.

According to the report on winning the oil end game from the Rocky Mountain Institute and the Pentagon, the U.S. could eliminate our dependance on oil by investing a hundred and eighty billion over ten years.

Dennis Hayes advocates investing 30 billion in implementing solar power over five years as a way of addressing energy problems and reducing the chances of

global warming.

These two proposals would greatly improve our security and the health of the planet for less money than is planned for the Ballistic Missile Defense System, which is between 800 and 1200 billion dollars over 15 years.

Also, this impact assessment does not address the potential threats of these weapons falling into the hands of terrorists. And I think that that is really a significant issue. If we don't develop, they cannot fall into the hands of terrorists. If we do develop them, they can. And particularly since the scope of this project is to have different elements deployed throughout the world, and we can't be on top of every local deployment area all of the time, it greatly increases the chance that something like that could happen.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Stephen Gonzalez.

STEPHEN GONZALEZ: How you all doing? As you said, my name is Stephen Gonzalez. I'm a resident of planet Earth. I think that is really about all that needs to be said about where I live.

As the subject matter of the defense system covers the whole planet, as is implied by the neat charts and graphs, it does not -- that is kind of a given -- what I find amazing is that the biggest issue is that they've

seen the need to integrate a system against a localized threat. Yet the threats to the implementation of the system are not taken holistically; i.e., well, we'll worry about a site-by-site assessment of the environmental impact threat. If you're going to impact the water in one place, it's going to impact the water somewhere else, too. Shouldn't we be tying the threats to the system showstoppers -- which I still don't know what they are? What would -- I -- I'd like to know what would have given these people a red flag to say maybe we shouldn't do this? It's not the depletion of the environment or public health or pissing people off around the world. Those aren't showstoppers. I'm scared to know what the showstoppers are to them. Must be pretty major, like the whole atmosphere lighting on fire. Is that a showstopper?

You know, I mean, laughter is good. You know, I wish I -- it was that funny actually. I have just -- I want to bring to the attention of everyone here that it's good we're here but we need to talk to other people. Someone brought up the issue of communication. We're not talking about the same issues of defense. What is a defense to us? What is a threat to our safety? I'm a lot more concerned right now about dying of asthma than I am of Osama Bin laden. I can feel my lungs collapsing every day. I can smell it in my water. I can't see the

mountains. And that was not brought by a terrorist. None of those effects were brought about by terrorists or weapons of mass destruction.

You know, these -- the very process by which we're protecting ourselves are creating the greatest threats to our security. At some point that has to be evaluated. This whole system is really about a very specific threat from a very specific place. This is about choosing a style of conflict, choosing a path of conflict that they've decided is the best way they can win of all of the scenarios of direct conflict engagement or technological engagement. They've decided this is the best way.

You know, I -- I'd like to think there isn't a conflict that is predetermined. I would like to think there is still some hope for diplomacy and such that they've got it planned out we're going to eventually fight somebody. I'll leave you to wonder who.

Don't be afraid to talk to people.

MR. BONNER: Stella Levy.

STELLA LEVY: Thank you to everyone who has spoken so far. I think it's been -- I have learned so much and I feel like I really understand a lot more than I did when I came in. There is not very much really that I can add to a lot of the things that have been said because I don't have the particular expertise.

I'm a local attorney concerned with human rights and peace. And so one thing I thought I might address is something that was alluded to by several of the speakers and that has to do with the process we're involved in here.

As an attorney, that is something we're always concerned about is process. At first when I first heard about the hearing and when I came here and saw all of the nice exhibits you had put up, my first impulse was this is really cool -- you know, this is really nice and how nice we've all been invited. But now I don't think so anymore because I'm noticing that there were only four locations at all where public testimony has been invited: Virginia, Sacramento, California, Hawaii and Alaska. That seems to me to be not nearly enough public input. That point has already been made.

I would like to talk about Exhibit ES-3, which is part of the Executive Summary. If you want to go along with me, that exhibit shows the effected environment. This is about environment that we're talking about here today. I looked at that to see what the affected environment was. All of the environment that can be affected is divided into nine biomes, as well a broad ocean area and the atmosphere. I went through that and I saw the following. I saw that we're talking about the

Arctic regions, North Atlantic Ocean, Pacific Ocean, Alaska, Canada and Greenland. Then some more Arctic regions and also Alaska, deciduous forest and Eastern and North Western U.S. and Europe, Chaparral. That is California Coast, Mediterranean from the Alps to the Sahara Desert, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Caspian Sea. This is a lot of area here. And these are areas that are labeled as "affected areas." Oh, the Grasslands. That is the whole prairie of the Midwest. The desert. Oh, the arid Southwest. New Mexico, Arizona, Utah and the Rocky Mountains, as well as the Alps, Pacific Equatorial Islands, which I don't know. Maybe that is why we're going to be in Hawaii. Northern -- you've got to turn the page. Northern Australia. And then how about the broad ocean area. That has no particular latitudinal range and that's the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Ocean. And then the really big one, the atmosphere, which is the atmosphere which envelops the entire earth.

That looks to me like a global environmental impact. And it seems to me only fair and some kind of rule that I think is codified in lots of different places that the people that are effected by legislation and -- and programs get to talk about it, get to respond.

Well, that is going to be a lot more than the people in the U.S. Even if you say four hearings is enough in

the U.S. --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who said that?

STELLA LEVY: Who said it? Nobody. I did not say it. Even if you do, this is a global environmental impact, this Star Wars Program. And, therefore, I'm not impressed with the hearing anymore. I think four is completely minimal. And so I would like to take the remainder of the time, if you would allow me, to make some suggestions of things that maybe other people might want to add, things that we might be able to do and do a little organizing here; which is, first of all, I think it would be entirely appropriate if you -- anybody who knows anyone and has connections, friends on legislation, which I'm a big supporter, lawsuits -- I think some lawsuits are called for for the reasons that were explained, which is the Environmental Impact Report is really inadequate and does not -- does not meet basic legal requirements.

I think that would be a very good thing to do. You should get ready for that and -- Colonel -- and another thing too is there are a number of people here representing different organizations, Physicians for Social Responsibility, FCL has -- there is also Friends Committee on National Legislation, different groups and so forth. Different groups. I think really we can get the word out through our emails and so forth about this.

And I'm also concerned about contacts in Europe for those like WILPF, for instance, which is an international organization or any international organization, Greenpeace, whatever, that you belong to because I think that people in Europe, Australia and so forth have a right to know about this and to have the same information that we have. And people may have other ideas.

Now, just a little personal note here. My son lives in Southern Switzerland in the Canton of Tacino. He married a woman who is teaching. I'm going to let them know. I saw the Alps are in here. They're in the southern Alps. And I know that when I've gone to visit them, I can tell you those "pace" flags are hanging all over the place. People there really care about peace. They were part of a demonstration in Milan that was humongous. And I think there would be a lot of concern and there should be a lot of concern.

I really think it's unfair to put a Star Wars system into place and not allow people who will be affected to weigh in on that matter.

And I guess my final suggestion would be to vote for change of Administration.

MR. BONNER: Byron Diel.

BYRON DIEL: I'm Byron Diel. I'm a paramedic and music activist. I'm representing Peace Fresno and the

band, Superfluid Helium 3. I'm going to address my comments given the possibility, however unlikely, that the system would actually work and that it's not just a big pork barrel corporate welfare project. Let's leave that large probability temporarily aside.

As the Bush doctrine of pre-emptive war required a concrete demonstration -- case-in-point being the invasion of Iraq -- the breaking of the ABM Treaty and the consequential bringing of the real war into the theater of space also requires a concrete example of which I believe Alternative 2 to be the -- the prototype.

And while I'm not generally a betting man, I would speculate that Alternative 2 is a foregone conclusion and that we're currently engaged in a process of a pseudo-imitation democracy and pacification of the public.

Alternative 2, I believe, to be a Trojan horse of sorts, given the facts the openly stated intentions of the authors of the project for the New American Century work and the Vision for 2020 and other similar documents are to create full spectrum dominance; first, by negating the threat of deterrence and increasing the perceived virility of our own nuclear arsenal by illuminating the threats of being shot back at.

Then to move on by actually creating space-based offensive weaponry and then to deny access to space for

other nations. The threshold being crossed by Option 2 is a veritable Pandora's Box, moving the militarization of space from the purely informational level to actual weaponization.

And the true environmental impact of such a threshold of crossing, I believe, must be examined on a multi-generational basis, given the dangerous president being set.

That is it.

MR. BONNER: Michael Comer.

MICHAEL COMER: I'd like to use this one if I could. Well, I apologize for what could be considered inappropriate attire. I came straight from work.

My name is Michael Comer. I live in Carmichael. I'm -- in the interest of full disclosure I am a member of the Sacramento Area Peace Action but I'm not here speaking as an official representative of that body.

First of all, I'd like to point out that there is a serious misnaming of this project, as far as it being missile defense. Missile defense is actually the linchpin of an offensive first strike capability.

I find it curious that George Bush has ordered the deployment of this system without comprehensive testing. Perhaps the reason is that the system would not likely pass that testing. I think if you talk about the missile

base system, it's really helpful if you have -- what do you call it? -- a transponder or some kind of a beacon in the target you're trying to hit.

So in all likelihood, the missile-based system will fail or at least be considered to be inoperative, which means it would be required to move on to the next phase, which I heard referred to -- basically the character of that next phase would be a satellite network surrounding the Earth. These satellites would be a base for laser weaponry. It has to be considered what would be the power source that could power a laser that could be strong enough to take out a missile or a land-based target. That would be nuclear power.

So if you want to consider environmental impact, we're going to have launches of missiles with nuclear materials aboard. If those missiles fail, we'll have nuclear material raining back on us. If a satellite is successfully launched and it falls out of orbit, it will be bringing back to Earth nuclear materials. I have not heard any of these issues addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

I actually -- I think I pretty much have no more to say than that.

Thank you very much.

MR. BONNER: Winnie Detwieler.

WINNIE DETWIELER: My name is Winnie Detwieler. I'm here on behalf of Sacramento Area Peace Action and our 4,000 plus supporters, both to comment -- both to comment on the PEIS and to register a complaint with the manner --

MR. BONNER: Let me turn this off. I can get the other one for you.

WINNIE DETWIELER: Okay. I'm here on behalf of Sacramento Area Peace Action and our 4,000 plus supporters here, both to comment on the PEIS and register a complaint in which the manner in which the hearing has been scheduled.

There's been no widespread publicity in California that we're aware of regarding this hearing today in Sacramento. Is this some sort of the stealth strategy to limit public input on such critical issues. The question is: Can the Draft PEIS be legitimate if there is not adequate notice of the document in the hearings on this matter?

What is most disturbing, however, is that the current Administration is forging ahead with components of the first two interceptors for the BMDS, making a mockery of these hearings. It's even more perplexing that the interceptors were just installed and had not been tested in the system. The tests have been continually postponed and the Pentagon's Chief Weapon Evaluator has said the

interceptors may only be capable of hitting their target about 20 percent of the time.

Why is our government spending billions of dollars in risking the beginning of a nuclear arms race on a so-called missile shield with such an abysmal record?

The greatest danger we face is not some intercontinental ballistic missile carrying nuclear warheads to our shores; but are reigniting nuclear arms race and motivating countries that fear us to attempt illegal acquisitions of nuclear weapons. They see the technology for our Missile Defense System can also be used offensively against them. Their defense against our military superiority would be to either produce many nuclear ballistic missiles to overwhelm our 20 percent system or to use secret delivery system weapons smuggled into our country or delivered by short-range missiles launched just off shore.

Forging ahead with the missile defense system will create terrible consequences from pollution from rocket launches, space debris and accidents within the system or involving civilians.

Other groups are scheduled to testify more comprehensively on this environmental hazard. But I'm emphasizing here all people on Earth, not just Americans, face grave environmental threats from this drive to

dominate the world by dominating space.

The environmental pollution may kill us slowly if we don't do it quickly with a nuclear war. But the greatest environmental impact will be to make the entire planet more dangerous to all forms of life and we Americans more vulnerable and not safer.

Most Americans consider nuclear war unthinkable; but apparently our leaders in Congress do not. It is astounding to see the turn around on proliferation and new nuclear weapons in this Administration.

Will threatening other nations encourage them to cooperate with a non-proliferation treaty? Will the U.S. violations of the treaty persuade other nations to embrace non-proliferation? We think not.

Similarly, the abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty last year by this Administration in order to pursue this fantasy missile shield will not promote international cooperation on disarmament.

We can only conclude that this rush to further develop and deploy this ill-conceived missile defense shield is driven by ideology and politics and fueled by the greed for profits from this costly boondoggle. That is what it is, a boondoggle.

The leading scientists and Nobel Prize Laureates have condemned this as irrevocable and dangerous to global

security. But this Administration rushes headlong into a hasty deployment. The term coined to characterize this drive is a "rush to failure."

In conclusion, we at Sacramento Area Peace Action condemn the Alternatives 1 and 2 with extreme threat proposed on our nation and the world. We would support the No Action Alternative if there had been a legitimate attempt at researching and weighing a true alternative of no action. Such a proposal should have encompassed a suspension of research and development, no testing and no initial deployment. It should have evaluated the cost effectiveness of vigorous pursuit of international cooperation on nuclear disarmament.

As it stands, the No Action Alternative does not meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. For this reason, we consider the Draft PEIS inadequate and insufficient for proceeding with the BMDS.

MR. BONNER: Is Rick Thomas still here?

RICK THOMAS: Yeah. Good evening, sir. Good evening ma'am. Evening all. I drove up from Fullerton, Southern California through a blizzard coming from Reno. Long story. And I've come to make some comments and I've come to ask a few questions.

I'd like to endorse most of the things I've heard here; not all, but most. I work as an addiction

counselor. I'm a Veteran. I don't -- I don't get to work with what you would calling a fun bunch of folks sometimes. But one thing I have found is that when I'm angry or when they're angry, people don't hear. I believe there is a lot of stuff here to be angry about.

One of the things I'd like to say is that one of the things that leads to addiction is family disfunction. And family disfunction often takes place with very good intentions. I'm sure these gentlemen who came here tonight to listen to us have good intentions.

Somebody asked earlier, "Where are the people?" I would guess that a lot of them are either at home unwinding from a ten-hour day, trying to make ends meet. Or they're at work at their second job in order to help the kids gets clothes so they can go to school. Yeah, I'd like to say we need more meetings about this. I'd love to see more people involved in this.

First point, addiction counselors work with overflow emotions. We can laugh or we can cry. Those are the overflow emotions. It is easy, I think, sometimes to laugh at the silliness of some of the stuff. Yeah, if we spend another 250 trillion dollars over the next decade we'll really be safe. How silly is that?

I think we can give checks to every -- everybody in the Middle East and be much safer with that amount of

money myself. Everett Dirksen -- Everett Dirksen, he had a line that said, "A million here, a million there. Pretty soon you're talking about real money."

The thing I'd like to say about that is that if this money was used for pure research, that would be fine with me. But what I see happening here is that this money goes towards an in-process research, which we've already heard from a lot a folks more articulate than I -- a Nobel Laureates, scientists, retired people -- saying this isn't going to work in the long run.

I'd also back up a point made earlier about geosynchronous orbit. I was involved throughout the 80's with a thing called High Frontier. Former Princeton professor, Gerard K. O'Neill, he said that if we would use this money that we bandy about so much like we used with NASA, the money that the government put into the NASA program throughout the 60's and 70's, created technologies and investments in the private sector $7 for every $1 invested at the Federal Government level.

I don't see how this program could create this in the private investments. I think if we talked about putting space stations up like Gerard K. O'Neill talked about that would be a much better way to get something going up there.

Lastly, a reporter once asked Mohamed Ghandi what he

thought of Western Civilization. His answer was, "I think it's a great idea." And I think it's a great idea, too. And I think if we can maybe reach across the aisle a little bit and get down to some of the more human things we're both looking for, maybe there is a way we can work this stuff out.

Nelson Mandela in his inauguration speech -- and I loved it -- he said, "I'm only running once. That is it." In his -- in his inauguration speech -- I get choked up talking about it -- he said, "After 27 years in prison I firmly believe that it is no longer man's worst that we fear the most. I firmly believe it's man's best that we fear the most."

So what I have here to ask tonight is: Where is our best in this? Where is our best in this? Can't this money be spent better for your kids, for your family? For your kids, for your family? For these people's families? My God, what are we doing? What are we doing?

Thanks for your time.

MR. BONNER: Fawn Hadley.

FAWN HADLEY: Hi. My name is Fawn Hadley. I hadn't intended on speaking tonight but I was inspired so I'm mostly going to read. I'm really glad I got to follow the gentleman I just followed.

My background is in philosophy and I work in a girls'

group home. And I see the family disfunction and how it affects those people everyday as well.

I've spent the first half of my life understanding why I self-sabotaged. I've gone to courses that have helped me to learn that I could not fix a problem with the same mind that created it, which is what Einstein said.

We have programs now that have technology that can actually change the way that we think. We have to choose that. It's a choice we have to make. But we can actually change from a victim mentality to a very powerful mentality in taking responsible for our actions. This kind of technology is also available in Israel and practiced on a regular basis all over the world through a program called Landmark Education. There is also a program called the HeartMath that teaches thinking through the heart, as opposed to strictly through the head.

There is a book that was written by a man named Goleman called Emotional Intelligence. And he -- he took his book from a program -- I can't remember if it's Life and Mind or Mind and Life. I think it's Life and Mind Institute, which is the Dalai Lama and the U.S. universities' psychology programs. They come together once a year for a week, I believe, to try to understand how we can become emotionally intelligent.

We have to look at how thinking should be our most

powerful resource. We can change how we think. I told you, I'm kind of skipping around a little bit. We have more power in our minds than a ballistic missile. Einstein, Galileo, Max Planck, to give a few examples. Taking responsibility for who we are and what we've done to people is the fastest icebreaker you'll ever find. If someone takes responsibility for something that they've -- that they've done to you, it's really hard to fault them; if they have from the heart taken responsibility. You -- it's a natural communication opener. It just automatically connects your humanness when somebody takes responsibility for doing what they've done. And I don't see that going on in our life very much, in our world very much but it's possible.

If you think I'm in a fantasy world, I'm in the same group as Max Planck and Albert Einstein, only on social issues. Let's vote an emotionally intelligent human into office. There are -- each one of us has an opportunity with every interaction we have with every person to spread that kind of integrity and communication with other people.

The programs I mentioned earlier, Landmark Education and HeartMath both have websites. There is also a man named Gregg Braden, who was first a geologist, I believe. Then he worked in the Defense System. Then he worked for

SYSCO System Computers. And he has -- for the last 12 years he's traveled around to monasteries and such and done research on our human past and what has led us to where we are today. Very interesting man. He also has a website, Gregg Braden. He also has a book called The Isaiah Effect and the last one was the God Code.

Responsibility and communication unites us. I think that is it. Hope I haven't confused anybody.

MR. BONNER: Caroline Schmidt.

CAROLINE SCHMIDT: I wasn't going to speak either but I just wanted to thank all of the people who inspired me: Pallo Deftereos and Winnie Detwieler. They've made me more aware than I ever have in my entire life of what is going on around me. Through those organizations we're going to do another nuclear forum next year, try to get the universities, try to speak to the students who are coming up.

And when I looked at her writing, I thought maybe she was the Sac Bee. Well, the Sac Bee was invited a couple of times. And Mr. Mort Salisman is going to hear from me tomorrow because I do not understand why the Sac Bee would not be here to write to get the people to know what is going on, to gather us together to get forces behind us. It needs to be done.

In a little joke on the refrigerator where a man is

standing on stage and he's asked to play a concerto. He says, "Don't make me come down there" to the audience. I'm going to go down there. I don't know how successful I will be. But maybe if everybody who lives in Sacramento will call Mr. Mort Salisman and leave messages on his machine and ask him why nobody was here and why Channel 3 and Channel 10 didn't come either.

I don't know what they're doing but I know -- I don't know. I don't think so because they checked the list. When I hear all of you speak so heartfelt and so glorious about how you feel about this country and what the right thing to do is, I'm in the right neighborhood. And whoever gets in office next time, we have to watch them like a hawk.

Thank you very much.

MR. BONNER: That is the end of the list of folks who signed up to speak. I'd like to offer an open invitation if somebody hasn't spoken and they'd like to take the opportunity.

Please, if you could give us your name and if you have an affiliation, that would be helpful.

HARRY WANG: My name is Harry Wang. And I'm a physician and a member of PSR Sacramento, Physicians for Social Responsibility. I did sign up and I guess my name got overlooked. I know it's getting late.

I believe in the separation of church and State, especially these days. I also believe in the separation of science and State. And I think this has been an issue for our current Administration because I think a lot of our science has gotten politicized in many, many different areas. I also question if the PEIS provides objective scientific information upon which to really base a decision.

I realize that there is a law passed by Congress, a mandate from the government to go ahead with the Ballistic Missile Defense System. But if you're really going to look at the science of the environmental impact, I don't think -- I don't think it's sufficient, this information provided.

I also, you know, agree with many of the comments already made about concerns about toxic pollutants, particularly perchlorate concerns about the debris in space.

But these are just -- these are agonizing times for all of us in the public. It's agonizing because of the decisions that our government is making. It's agonizing seeing how our moneys are being spent. It makes us wonder if the need of our citizens are really being looked at, whether they take priority compared to other agenda items.

For example, this year the government allocated 40

million dollars to try and come up with a new influenza vaccine. As we all know, we have a terrible shortage of influenza vaccine. It's a long process of four, five, six months to develop a vaccine. The government properly allocated funds to come up with a more efficient way to come up with a vaccine. 40 million that was allocated earlier this year before the recent shortage.

On the other hand, Project BioShield passed by Congress just this summer pushed by the Bush Administration allocated 5.6 billion dollars for the next ten years to develop vaccines and medications for anthrax, smallpox and other biological agents.

Once again, we -- the government does have a dilemma of how to deal with bioterrorism, how to deal with missiles and how this drains from other health and environmental priorities is just a highlight. Just looking at the flu vaccine versus Project BioShield, once again, 5.6 billion dollars. This is to develop another smallpox vaccine after the smallpox vaccines that were shipped out by CDC, many have been destroyed because they weren't used.

In this context, we as citizens are going to react to other programs that are -- that we're asked to look at, quote, asked to look at.

Now, in the 1960's, physicians were asked to prepare

a response to the possibility that there would need to be a medical response if there were a nuclear war. That was something that PSR really got energized about and led to the origins of Physicians for Social Responsibility. Studies were published based upon data gathered from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And it was concluded that nuclear war could very well bring on the final epidemic.

So how do you prepare for nuclear war? What would be the environmental impact of such an event? I believe that the BMDS escalates the arms race and will not make us any safer. We need to utilize non-weapon system approaches to try to accomplish the goal, if our goal is really making our world safer.

Thank you.

MR. BONNER: Are there other folks who would like to speak? If you'd like to sit there, that is fine. You can stay there. Just give us your name.

CHARLOTTE DEFTEREOS: I'm Charlotte Deftereos and I agree with everything my husband, Pallo Deftereos, said.

Now that I have a chance to speak, it's going to be, I promise you, real short. This lady here suggested something that I've been thinking a long time and that was the use of the Marshall Plan.

Can you imagine what the chain reaction to the Marshall Plan by a number of countries would be?

That is all I think I've got to say.

MR. BONNER: Thank you.

SHAUNA SMITH: Hi. I'm Shauna Smith. I'm with the Physicians for Social Responsibility and Therapists for Social Responsibility. I want to know if it's possible to get a tape of the comments that have been spoken today?

MR. BONNER: I don't know that we'll have a tape but we'll have a tape of the comments. I believe it will be available -- I believe if you can put a checkmark next to your name or send us an email, we'll get that to you.

Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have already spoken but I wanted to ask a question. I'll try to be brief. I wanted to address a question to you, sir, and your associates.

Will you pledge to advocate for increasing the number of hearings and public, you know, opportunities for public input on this environmental impact report?

MR. BONNER: Marty, you want to speak to that?

MR. DUKE: I mean, we've looked at --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who is "we"?

MR. DUKE: I say myself. We are trying to publicize this. We have the website and try to make comments because it's really impossible to go to all of the sites we need to go to. And we try to give the avenues for people to have an opportunity through the website, through

public forums, through email, faxes to make their case known to the Programmatic EIS.

CAROLINE SCHMIDT: Why Sacramento? Why was Sacramento picked?

KAREN BLOMQUIST: You missed 3,000 miles of country between Arlington and Sacramento.

MR. DUKE: We looked at the states where we have a lot of the MDS program and the Capitol.

KAREN BLOMQUIST: That is not good enough. You'll be hearing from Europe because of it not just of the U.S. It will never be good enough. No matter how you sugarcoat it, it ain't good enough.

MR. BONNER: Any other comments?

ROD MACDONALD: You know, I -- I really find it just stunning that something this national importance -- I heard about it because somebody called in on a local radio show and started talking about it and I -- what? What am I hearing in the midst of traffic? I put it on my calendar. I don't really have time as a scientist to study all of this. I find it just stunning that this much impact or -- you know, your adequate four times we've done it. But what publicity? The Bee isn't here. We know how to turn people out for Staples Stadium. We can sell the world. We can't -- I find it stunning by the lack -- how it's under-publicized.

Now we've done it. We have gone through the formality. Give us an email and website. That is nice. But the organic standards, where they try to ruin organic standards, sewage waste and stuff like that. The government got more feedback than it has ever gotten on a single issue before.

PALLO DEFTEREOS: This is such a tremendous issue. I just don't -- I've been studying it, as I said, for 60 years. I was in World War II. And I studied foreign affairs before the war started. And with an issue of this size, what is the big hurry? I mean, these kinds of hearings should be had -- should be had all over the country. I just don't understand it.

MR. BONNER: Thank you.

SHAUNA SMITH: I just would like to ask, do you actually have any power to make any of these -- I don't think we should actually be harassing you guys. You don't really have the power to make the decisions, do you?

MR. DUKE: Our point is to try to assess the impact of BMDS on the environment, to provide opportunities and very spirited comments, heartfelt comments that you have provided for us on the record and try to address those.

SHAUNA SMITH: But if we wanted more meetings, you couldn't make it happen anyway, right?

MR. DUKE: We'd have to look it --

SHAUNA SMITH: But you, personally --

MR. DUKE: -- or the political impacts --

SHAUNA SMITH: You, personally, could you do anything?

MR. DUKE: I would have to go back, go with the heart of leadership.

SHAUNA SMITH: We'd appreciate it if there was any chance.

MR. DUKE: Again, I appreciate you all coming out. Like you said, a lot of you came out after a hard day's work to provide the comments. And we all know these are very sincere comments. We'll take the comments and go back and look at them and address them in the EIS.

I appreciate you all coming out and providing your comments.

Thank you.

(The proceedings concluded at 9:43 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

OF

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

The undersigned certified shorthand reporter of the state of California does hereby certify:

That the foregoing deposition was taken before me at the time and place therein set forth, at which time the witness was duly sworn by me;

That the testimony of the witness and all objections made at the time of the deposition were recorded stenographically by me and thereafter transcribed, said transcript being a true copy of my shorthand notes thereof.

In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name this date_____.

_____

Certificate Number_____